

## REMARKS

The above amendment and these remarks are responsive to the FINAL Office Action mailed 29 April 2004 of Examiner Akiba K. Roginson-Boyce.

Claims 1-6, 13-26, and 29 are pending in the application, none as yet allowed.

### 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 13-15, 17, 29 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by Guheen et al., U.S. Patent 6,615,166.

Guheen et al. describes prioritizing components of a network framework required for implementation of technology.

Applicants has previously amended independent claims 13 and 29 to clarify that work product descriptions are specifically separated from process descriptions, and then related through the three phase process set forth in the claim, and currently amend these claims to set forth details of each phase in such a manner as to distinguish the teachings of Guheen et al. Those details include the concepts of building a database of engagement models in

phase 1; developing a definition of client requirements and an attack hypothesis for addressing the client requirements by selecting from the database an appropriate engagement model for addressing the client requirements and defining a fit parameter in phase 2; and utilizing the engagement templates to define and collect metrics including risk parameters, cost parameters, and customer satisfaction parameters across a plurality of engagement models, and responsive to these metrics, managing a family of engagement models, including adjusting market attack plans and allocation of constrained resources responsive to families of engagement models in phase 3.

Guheen et al. do not describe separating work product descriptions from process descriptions, and then relating them through the three phase process now recited in claims 13 and 29.

Claims 14, 15, and 17 depend from claim 13 and are similarly distinguished from Guheen et al.

**35 U.S.C. 103**

Claims 1, 2, 4, and 26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Guheen et al. in view of Dixon's article

"Integrated Support for Project Management."

Claims 3, 5, and 6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(e) over Guheen et al. in view of Dixon and Boman-Amuah, U.S. Patent 6,615,199.

Claims 16, and 20-25 have been rejected under Guheen in view of Bowman-Amuah.

These claims have been amended as stated above, either directly or by reference to antecedent claims, and are distinguished from Guheen and the combination of Guheen et al. and Bowman-Amuah by the amendments which clarify that work product descriptions are specifically separated from process descriptions, and then related through the three phase process set forth in the parent claims, now amended to cite specific system components or process steps relating to that three phase process in such a manner as to distinguish the various applied combinations of Guheen, Dixon, and Boman-Amuah.

## **SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION**

Applicants urge that the above amendments be entered

and the case passed to issue with claims 1-6, 13-26, and 29.

The Application is believed to be in condition for allowance and such action by the Examiner is urged. Should differences remain, however, which do not place one/more of the remaining claims in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to phone the undersigned at the number provided below for the purpose of providing constructive assistance and suggestions in accordance with M.P.E.P. Sections 707.02(j) and 707.03 in order that allowable claims can be presented, thereby placing the Application in condition for allowance without further proceedings being necessary.

Sincerely,

S. D. Barnes, et al.

By



Shelley M Beckstrand  
Reg. No. 24,886

Date: 27 July 2004

Shelley M Beckstrand, P.C.  
Attorney at Law  
61 Glenmont Road  
Woodlawn, VA 24381-1341

Phone: (276) 238-1972